REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 12-28 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kilgore et al. (US Pat. No. 6,497,786) in view of Hurter et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 4,948,450). In view of the claim amendments made the aforementioned Applicants believe that rejection has been rendered moot. However, in the interest present expediting examination of the Applicants wish to make the following remarks of record for the purpose of explaining why the claimed invention is patentable over the prior art cited in the rejection.

As reflected in amended Claim 12 (the only independent claim currently pending in the application), Applicants' invention is directed to a process for bonding substrates with hormelt adhesive comprising:

- providing at least two substrates for bonding together;
- optionally, applying at least one primer to at least one of the substrates;
- spraying at least one hotmelt adhesive in liquid containing nanoscale particles having form ferromagnetic, ferromagnetic, superparamagnetic piezoelectric properties onto at least one of the substrates;
- pressing the at least two substrates together so that the optional primer and the hotmelt adhesive are between the substrates and exposing at least the

> hotmelt adhesive to at least one alternating field selected from the group consisting of electrical, magnetic and electromagnetic alternating fields to heat the hotmelt adhesive; and

(e) cooling the hotmelt adhesive.

The Kilgore reference describes systems, methods and apparatus for bonding a plurality of substrates via a solventless, curable adhesive. A workpiece, according to the reference, may be assembled from a plurality substrates with the curable adhesive disposed therebetween. Pressure is applied to the workpiece and the workpiece is irradiated with variable frequency microwave energy.

The Kilgore reference does suggest that the adhesive "may contain a microwave susceptible material dopant) which would serve to increase the susceptibility of adhesive to microwaves." [Column 11, lines 24-26] the reference fails to teach or suggest that the microwave susceptible material could be in the form of nanoscale particles (as required by Applicants' claimed process) or that any advantage could be obtained by using particles of this specific type.

The Kilgore reference is generally silent with respect to the particle size of the microwave susceptible materials suitable for use in the described adhesive bonding process. The reference does acknowledge "[t]he quantity of dopant required for optimum microwave heating efficiency depends

on the physical properties of the dopant, such as the conductivity and the particle size and shape." [Column 11, However, little additional specific guidance lines 35-38] with respect to selecting the dopant particle size is The only dopant materials whose particle sizes are mentioned are the carbon fibers described at Column 11, particles. clearly not nanoscale 49-56. which are Elsewhere in the reference it is noted that dopants in powder form (no particle size given) ineffective are (Column 12, lines 36-49).

Based on this disclosure, a worker of ordinary skill in the art would not have found it obvious to choose to use a hotmelt adhesive containing nanoscale particles having superparamagnetic ferromagnetic, ferromagnetic, or process for bonding piezoelectric properties in а substrates wherein the hotmelt adhesive is sprayed liquid form onto at least one of the substrates.

The Hurter reference relied on by the Examiner does not cure the deficiencies of the Kilgore reference, as it provides no guidance or motivation to modify a bonding process using a hotmelt adhesive sprayed in liquid form onto a substrate by incorporating into the hotmelt adhesive nanoscale particles having ferromagnetic, ferromagnetic, superparamagnetic or piezoelectric properties. The Hurter reference is completely devoid of any discussion regarding the selection of suitable dopants for hotmelt adhesives to be used in a bonding process involving exposing the hotmelt

adhesive to an alternating field selected from the group consisting of electrical, magnetic and electromagnetic Applicants' claimed process thus would alternating fields. not have been obvious to a worker of ordinary skill in the from the disclosures of the Kilgore and Hurter references, either alone or in combination.

CONCLUSION

remarks above, amendments and In view of the Applicants ask for reconsideration and allowance of all Should any fees be due for entry and pending claims. consideration of this have not Amendment that accounted for, the Commissioner is authorized to charge them to Deposit Account No. 01-1250.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen D. Harper (Reg. No. 33,243)

610-278-4927

Attorney for Applicants

SDH/img

Henkel Corporation Patent Law Department 2200 Renaissance Blvd., Suite 200 Gulph Mills, PA 19406